

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Substance of Telephonic Interview**

The undersigned would like to thank Examiners Frisby and Mosser for conducting the telephonic interview on Thursday, June 28, 2007. In the interview we discussed the differences between the present invention and the main prior art of Bajer and Bro. The inventor pointed out the importance of symbols and how their use differentiates the present invention from either Bajer or Bro. The Examiners suggested adding “symbol” to the claims, as well as provided more detail in the claims as to the interaction of the allegories.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 14 and 16 have been canceled. However, claim 18 is not mentioned in the rejection, and the undersigned does not see how claim 18 falls within the same rejection as claims 14 and 16.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 12, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,736,642 to Bajer et al (“Bajer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,722,418 to Bro (“Bro”). Claim 1 has been amended to read “wherein the allegories are represented by at least one symbol.” A symbol is defined in the patent application as “a thing that implies

something more than its obvious, immediate, and direct meaning and comes to typify, represent, or recall something regardless of whether that something is totally known, understood, or defined.” Neither Bajer nor Bro use symbols in their applications. The representations used in Bajer and Bro clearly have “obvious, immediate, and direct meanings.” The whole objective of Bajer and Bro is to create a training experience that is as close to an *actual* experience as possible. That is not the objective of the present invention. To this end, Bajer and Bro will use terms like "simulation," "virtual world," "realism," "representations," and "modeling" to convey their intent to create as real of an experience as they can. Claim 1 has also been amended to read “such that the second allegory builds on the first allegory and the comments and questions from the first allegory.” This shows the interrelation between the various allegories, which is not a function of either Bajer or Bro. Claim 1 has also been amended to read “wherein the at least one symbol is representative of an archetype.” The concept of the archetype says that we are all born with certain images already imprinted in us at birth. This allows such things as the sun, trees, and water to affect us emotionally in the same way across personalities and cultures. Thus, by understanding archetypes, the inventor can create allegories using symbols that resonate across personality types and cultures. The archetype allows the instructor to make some prediction as to how people will be impacted by various symbols.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,736,642 to Bajer et al (“Bajer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,722,418 to Bro (“Bro”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,077,085 to Parry (“Parry”).

Claims 2 and 7 have been amended to read “wherein the allegories are represented by at least one symbol.” A symbol is defined in the patent application as “a thing that implies something more than its obvious, immediate, and direct meaning and comes to typify, represent, or recall something regardless of whether that something is totally known, understood, or defined.” Neither Bajer nor Bro use symbols in their applications. The representations used in Bajer and Bro clearly have “obvious, immediate, and direct meanings.” Claims 2 and 7 have also been amended to read “such that the second allegory builds on the first allegory and the comments and questions from the first allegory.” This shows the interrelation between the various allegories, which is not a function of either Bajer or Bro.

Claims 5 and 10 have been amended to include “wherein the at least one symbol is representative of an archetype.” An archetype is defined in the present invention as “an original image inherited at birth common to all humans that emerges as a symbol in various forms to represent an emotion or intuition for a collection of emotions and to encourage certain actions.” Neither Bajer nor Bro use allegories and/or symbols to represent an archetype. Neither reference is designed to help people realize common characteristics of human beings.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

**BROUSE MCDOWELL**

July 18, 2007  
Date

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel A. Thomson', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel A. Thomson  
Reg. No. 43, 189  
Customer No. 26871